PATTERNS OF POWER · AN ESSAY

The Audit of the Faithful

The word recruits the army, and the army audits the word's performance: why the belief of the common man is load-bearing, and why a load-bearing member constrains the architect — whether the architect believes or not

Thomas J. Bryan

with Claude (Anthropic)

2026

PATTERNS OF POWER · AN ESSAY

The Audit of the Faithful

An essay on a constraint

The Loop the Bracket Left Open

The methods note that precedes this essay argued that the project brackets the sincerity of leaders because interiors cannot be observed and the function of belief is invariant under everything the locked room conceals. It rested that argument, in passing, on a claim this essay now unpacks, because the unpacking yields the constraint that completes the collection's account of how belief and power hold each other: the aggregate sincerity of the formed population is the load-bearing fact, and the individual ruler's heart is the rounding error. Load-bearing is an engineering word, and the project chose it as engineers use it. A load-bearing member is not decoration that can be repainted at the architect's whim; it is structure, and structure *constrains the architect* — he builds what the member will carry, maintains what the member requires, and discovers, if he forgets, that the building does not consult his intentions on its way down. The belief of the common man — and above all of that intensified common man this collection calls the radical — is exactly such a member. It is what gives a leader his followers, his cheap force, his annuity instead of his plunder. And it comes, this essay argues, with a leash attached: a continuous, unsentimental audit of the leader's own performance of the word, conducted by the believers, enforced by their feet — and binding on the cynical leader and the devout one with perfect indifference, which is one more reason the bracket loses nothing by declining to tell them apart.

The Word Recruits the Army

Begin with the selection theorem the Iberian volumes established at swordpoint: the word selects the army. A legitimating language does not fly over interchangeable troops; it recruits exactly the coalition that believes it and repels the coalition that believes its rival — Ibn Hafsun's career, cycling through four words and watching each change of banner change his army under him, remains the collection's controlled demonstration. Now add the finding of the methods note about how frameworks gain their most intense recruits: the radical is produced by *disillusionment at asymmetry* — formed inside one word, he collides with the visible gap between that word and the conduct of the elites who administer it, takes the gap as the scandal his formation taught him it was, and falls into a rival framework that promises the accounting his first one defaulted on; and the radical mind, the record shows with great consistency, adds a clause the merely disillusioned omit: *that it falls to him, personally, to act.* The Westerner who abandoned the liberal formation

of his childhood for the Islamic State believed — totally, expensively, with his travel documents and his life; that is what made him worth recruiting. The university student who saw through capitalism to exploitation and offered himself to the vanguard believed — and Lenin, in the founding text of the type (a text whose title this collection borrowed for its own coda), built the entire architecture on the distinction: workers left to themselves develop only trade-union consciousness, the bargaining of the shop floor; *consciousness* — the full revolutionary framework — must be carried to the class from outside, by precisely these educated converts, whose belief is their qualification. In both cases the asset being recruited is the belief itself: the believer fights cheap, marches far, polices himself, dies forward. No paymaster can purchase what the word recruits for free.

But note what the recruiter has actually acquired, because the rest of the essay lives in it. He has acquired soldiers whose loyalty attaches to the *word*, not to him — he holds them only in his capacity as the word's visible performer; and he has acquired, in the radical specifically, soldiers pre-selected for the very faculty that delivered them: *asymmetry detection*. The radical came because he could see the gap between a word and its administrators' conduct. He has not lost the faculty by arriving. He has brought it inside, aimed, now, at his new leaders — and he will leave by the same door he entered, the moment the gap reappears.

The Colonel and the Caliph

The Islamic State is the constraint's modern laboratory, and its captured paperwork makes the case with a documentary nakedness the medieval files never afford. The organisation's strategic architect — established by the files Der Spiegel obtained after his death in 2014, and confirmed by the defector-interview literature since — was Samir al-Khlifawi, called Haji Bakr: a former colonel of Saddam Hussein's intelligence apparatus, a career officer of a *secular* police state, who by the testimony of those who traced his life had, before 2003, nothing to do with religion, and whose blueprints for the Islamic State read like what they were — a Ba'athist security service's organisational charts, informant networks and infiltration schedules, re-flagged. Around him in the leadership stood a stratum of the same formation: ex-officers of the dissolved Iraqi army and intelligence services, networked in an American detention camp, building with the only craft they had — the craft of the surveillance state. Here, if anywhere in the modern record, is the cynical apex of the user's hypothetical: an army of believers commanded, at the planning level, by professionals of a framework those believers would have called apostasy.

And now watch what the cynics' own files show the cynics doing — because it is not what a naive theory of manipulation predicts. Haji Bakr's documents budget, in his own hand, for the manufacture of the religious face: *we will appoint the smartest ones as Sharia sheiks*, the files note — train them, dispatch them, marry the brothers into the influential families. The secular colonel, holding an army recruited by a word he did not believe, found himself *obeying the word's specifications*: the public face must be clerical; the courts must be sharia courts; the punishments must be the punishments; the front-man at the very top could not be a colonel at all — the office the word offered was the caliphate, and the classical law of the caliphate has job requirements, descent from the Quraysh among them, which is why the man produced for the pulpit of Mosul was a doctor of Islamic studies whose lineage was proclaimed Qurayshi: the identical clause of the identical word that Cordoba reached for in 929, binding a twenty-first-century organisation run in part by Ba'athist intelligence officers. The word does not care who operates it. It dictates the terms of operation to whoever does — and the terms are set, finally, not by the operators but by the *believers*, because the believers are the army, and the army audits. The defector literature — dozens of exit interviews now sit in the

research record — returns the same findings again and again: the men and women who left did not, in the main, stop believing; they left because of what they *saw* — the corruption of emirs, the brutality against fellow Muslims, the gap between the proclaimed Islam and the leadership's conduct — and a portion of them left not toward home but *sideways*, toward groups they judged truer to the cause. The radical's audit, failed, does not produce an ex-radical. It produces a transfer.

The Student and the Cell

The vanguard case runs identically with the signs changed, and the user's example needs only its documentation supplied. The student who has made the conversion — seen the exploitation, accepted the framework, offered himself to history — goes looking for the real article: the professor who lives the analysis, the cell that is actually building the future. Suppose he finds, instead, the gap: the professor with the portfolio, the party leadership cutting comfortable deals with capitalist governments, the revolution indefinitely postponed in committee. The framework he carries tells him exactly what he is looking at — it has a whole vocabulary for it: opportunism, revisionism, betrayal of the class — and the framework tells him what to do about it, which is to find the *true* Marxists; and the institutional history of the international left is, to a first approximation, the sediment of exactly these audits: the splinters and expulsions and rival internationals, each new fragment founded on the charge that the last one's leaders had stopped performing the word, each recruiting the freshest believers precisely by its superior purity. The pattern is not a pathology of the left or of jihadism. It is the audit of the faithful operating wherever the faithful have somewhere else to go.

The Constraint, Formalised

State the mechanism in the collection's terms, because it earns a permanent place beside the selection theorem it completes. *The word recruits the army; the army's loyalty attaches to the word; the leader holds the army only as the word's performer; and the believers — selected, in the radical case, for asymmetry-detection — audit the performance continuously, with defection as the penalty.* From which three results follow.

First, the constraint is invariant under the leader's interior — the companion theorem to the methods note's bracket. The devout leader must perform the word because he believes it; the cynical leader must perform it because his soldiers do; and the cynic, knowing himself auditable, frequently *out-performs* the devotee — the collection's files are full of the type, from the chamberlain Almanzor burning a library's heterodox holdings to purchase the jurists' certification, to the Ba'athist colonels enforcing a rigorism no Iraqi Friday had seen in their lifetimes. Sincerity cannot be read from the performance, and the performance cannot be skipped by the insincere: the bracket, again, loses nothing.

Second, the constraint has teeth in proportion to the believers' *exit options* — and this folds the essay into the collection's oldest variable. Where rival vendors of the same word compete — ISIS against al-Qaeda's franchises, splinter against party, sect against church — the audit is merciless and purity *escalates*: each organisation must outbid the others' fidelity to hold its believers, and the spiral can drive conduct that is strategically suicidal and doctrinally compulsory — maximalism the leadership can see is ruinous and cannot renounce, because renunciation is the one move the load-bearing member will not carry; the collection has watched a caliph try it exactly once, at imperial scale, in 1229, and the empire dissolved in his hands. Where

the word has a monopoly vendor — an established church, a party-state with the borders sealed — the audit's penalty is blunted and slack returns to the leadership; which is why monopoly is what every incumbent of every word seeks, and why the faithful, read structurally, are a counterweight: a class the apex needs and does not own, whose jurisdiction is exit.

Third, the constraint explains a death this collection has already recorded without yet naming its law. When Sanchuelo extracted the caliphal succession from the sealed puppet in 1008, his army — the rootless professional instrument of the Amirid state — evaporated around him on the march home; the volume that told it called the evaporation position logic, troops loyal to pay negotiating with the next paymaster. The fuller account is this essay's: the Amirid regime's force was held together by the performance of the word — the fiction that the hajib served the caliph — and the heir's hand on the word itself was the failed audit that released every oath at once. The army did not stop being loyal. Its loyalty was never to the man.

❧

The Counter-Position, and the Close

The standing objection has real force and is conceded first: leaders are not passive before the audit — they manage it. They control information; they perform where visible and transact where hidden; they build, in the limiting case, an apparatus whose entire function is to keep the gap between word and conduct out of the believers' sight — and the Islamic State's Emni, the internal security organ the colonel's files describe, designed by surveillance professionals to watch the watchers and bury the discrepancies, is the type specimen. All true. But observe what the objection concedes in the conceding: the management apparatus is the constraint's *invoice*. The leadership that cannot afford to be seen pays for not being seen — in secrecy costs, in compartmentalisation, in the standing risk that one defector's testimony detonates the gap publicly (as the colonel's own captured files, in the end, did) — and the leadership that economises on concealment pays in performance instead. There is no third option; the leash is paid in one currency or the other; and the size of the bill is set, at every moment, by the intensity and the exit options of the believers — which is to say, by the common man's belief, doing what load-bearing members do.

That is the essay's finding, and it closes a circle the collection opened in its first volume. Belief makes force cheap: the founding theorem, demonstrated from the dhimma to the dinar. This essay adds the price of the cheapness: belief makes *leadership conditional* — the word that multiplies a leader's force holds a mortgage on his conduct, serviced in performance, audited by the faithful, foreclosed by their feet. The elite, sincere or cynical, formed or calculating, governs inside that mortgage; and the common man, who appears in every chronicle as the governed, the taxed, the marched and the buried, turns out to hold — in the one asset the chronicles never list, his belief — the standing power to repossess. He almost never knows it. The leaders always do. It is, the project suggests, among the most consequential asymmetries of knowledge in the whole architecture of durable hierarchies — and one more reason the project tracks the function of the word rather than the souls of its operators, for the function includes the leash, and the leash, unlike the souls, shows up in the record every time it is pulled. Tested — never revealed.

A Note on Sources

An essay's sources can be stated briefly. The Islamic State material rests on the captured files of Samir al-Khlifawi ("Haji Bakr") as reported by Christoph Reuter in Der Spiegel ("The Terror Strategist," 2015) and his book The Black Power; on the defector-interview literature, above all Speckhard and Yayla's studies of ISIS defectors and the Emni; and on the scholarship of the organisation's ex-Ba'athist stratum (Weiss and Hassan, ISIS: Inside the Army of Terror, among others). The phrase quoted from the files is as rendered in the published reporting. The vanguard architecture is Lenin's own, from What Is to Be Done? (1902) — the trade-union-consciousness distinction is his — read here beside the institutional history of left sectarianism. The medieval cases invoked — Ibn Hafsun's word-cycling, Almanzor's purchased orthodoxy, Sanchuelo's evaporating army, al-Ma'mun's renunciation, the caliphal title's Qurayshi requirement — are documented in this collection's Iberia Series, where their sources are given. This essay is the companion to the methods note The Bracket, and its theorem — the audit of the faithful, invariant under the leader's interior, priced in performance or concealment — belongs to the Patterns of Power project; its conclusions are held, like everything the project holds, as tested, never revealed.